APPENDIX A.

Opinion Below.

Before Bastian, *Senior Circuit Judge*, Burger and Wright, *Circuit Judges*.

Per Curiam: Appellant challenges the District Court's affirmance of rulings of Arbitration Board 282 that the local Special Board was not required to conduct its proceedings under Sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act and that the Special Board did not err in basing its award in part on awards made by other Special Boards and on an agreement with respect to "crew consist" made on another railroad.

Appellant contends that the Special Board was required to prepare at its expense a transcript of its proceedings and could not merely permit any party who desired a transcript to prepare one. The claim arises in a somewhat different posture than in *Bhd. of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pac. R. R. Co.*, No. 19,867, D. C. Cir., May 19, 1967; in the instant case the Brotherhood participated in the hearings and made objections to the Special Board's ruling that it was not required to provide a transcript.

To the extent that the Brotherhood's claim is that the Award of Arbitration Board 282 directed the local Special Boards to prepare transcripts, it falls because of the limited scope of judicial review as to Board 282's ruling that it did not intend such a requirement in its Award. Railway Labor Act, § 9, 45 U. S. C., § 159 (1964). The Brotherhood's main contention is that the Joint Resolution[1] which established Arbitration Board 282 and di-

[1] Public Law 88-108, 77 Stat. 132 (1963).

rected it to operate in accordance with Sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act subjects the local Special Boards, as creations of Arbitration Board 282, to the same requirements. This argument comes too late. It is merely another effort to impeach the original Award of 282 as being inconsistent with the Joint Resolution; it could and should have been raised in the action impeaching the Award, to which the Brotherhood was a party.[2] The decisions in that case are *res judicata* on this contention.[3]

We find no basis for disturbing the District Court's refusal to impeach the ruling of Arbitration Board 282 that the local Special Board could base its decision in part on awards of other local Special Boards and on an agreement on another railroad. Railway Labor Act, § 9.

Affirmed.

---

[2] Bhd. of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen v. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., 225 F. Supp. 11 (D. D. C.), *aff'd*, 118 U. S. App. D. C. 100, 331 F. 2d 1020, *cert denied*, 377 U. S. 918 (1964).

[3] Bhd. of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pac. R. R. Co., No. 19,867, D. C. Cir., May 19, 1967, slip opinion 5, n. 5. Judge Wright's dissent suggests that this issue is not resolved by principles of *res judicata* because this court remanded the issue to Arbitration Board 282 for its view after the Award had been upheld in the impeachment action. The remand would have been a meaningless gesture, he contends, if the issue was no longer open. Although the opinion is not clear on this point, it would seem that the remand was for the purpose of having Board 282 pass on the terms of its Award, rather than on the requirements of the Joint Resolution. The Board seems to have understood that to be its function, for its answer to the Brotherhood's question was that "the special boards of adjustment provided for in . . . Award 282 are not required by the terms of the Award to adhere to procedures prescribed in either Section 7 or Section 8 of the Railway Labor Act." Even assuming the remand was directed at the requirements of the Joint Resolution, this would merely indicate our action was mistaken; it could not change the finality of the earlier impeachment decision.

Wright, *Circuit Judge, dissenting:* Public Law 88-108[1] provides for compulsory arbitration of two issues in the labor dispute between the railroads and the union: the use of firemen on locomotives, and the so-called crew consist issue. Thus, as to these issues, Congress took the unprecedented action of denying the union the right to strike. Conscious of the seriousness of its action, however, Congress provided adequate due process safeguards. It required that the proceedings before the compulsory arbitration Board "shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act." Public Law 88-108, § 4.

Proceeding pursuant to the mandatory provisions of Sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act,[2] the compulsory arbitration Board resolved the fireman issue. With reference to the crew consist issue, it decided that local arbitration boards would be created to resolve this issue on a local basis, the action of the local boards to be reviewed by the national Board.

There is, of course, no provision in the Act for creation of local boards, but this action on the part of the national Board has been approved by this court.[3] What this court did not approve was the delegation of the national Board's authority to the local boards without the due process safeguards required by the Act, *i. e.*, Sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act.

Appellees admit that the proceedings before the local boards in these cases have not been conducted pursuant

---

[1] 77 Stat. 132 (1963), 45 U. S. C., § 157 (1964).

[2] 45 U. S. C., §§ 157-158 (1964).

[3] See *Brotherhood of Loc. Firemen & Enginemen v. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. Co.*, D. D. C., 225 F. Supp. 11, *affirmed*, 118 U. S. App. D. C. 100, 331 F. 2d 1020, *cert. denied*, 377 U. S. 918 (1964).

to Sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, and the union is here complaining the local boards' failure so to proceed. Since Congress, in requiring the union to submit to compulsory arbitration, deemed the Sections 7 and 8 safeguards necessary for proceedings before the national Board, it is inconceivable to me that the national Board may legally delegate its authority to local boards without such safeguards.[4]

I respectfully dissent.

APPENDIX B.

Judgment Below.

Before: Bastian, Senior Circuit Judge, and Burger and Wright, Circuit Judges.

Judgment.

These cases came on to be heard on the records on appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and were argued by counsel.

On Consideration Whereof, it is ordered and adjudged by this court that the order of the District Court appealed from in these cases is hereby affirmed.

Per Curiam.

Dated: May 19, 1967.

Separate dissenting opinion by Circuit Judge Wright.

---

[4] The majority's ruling that this issue is precluded by *res judicata* because of our decision in *Brotherhood of Loc. Firemen & Enginemen v. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. Co.*, *supra* Note 3, is difficult to understand. When this case was last before this court. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Certain Carriers, etc.*, 121 U. S. App. D. C. 230, 349 F. 2d 207 (1965), the *res judicata* argument was thoroughly explored in the briefs of these same parties. This court at that time remanded the Sections 7 and 8 safeguards issue to the Board. 121 U. S. App. D. C. at 233, 349 F. 2d at 210. I cannot believe this court intended the Board and these parties to waste their time debating an issue the majority now decides has been closed to debate since 1964.

APPENDIX C.

Judicial Code.

28 USC 1254 (1), 62 Stat. 928.

Cases in the courts of appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by the following methods:

(1) By writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case, before or after rendition of judgment or decree.

Public Law 88-108.

"Sec. 2. [Arbitration board]. There is hereby established an arbitration board to consist of seven members.

* * * * * * * *

"Sec. 3. The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth.

* * * * * * * *

"Sec. 4. To the extent not inconsistent with this joint resolution the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act [this section and section 158 of this title], the board's award shall be made and filed as provided in said sections and shall be subject to section 9 of said Act [section 159 of this title]. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby designated as the court in which the award is to be filed, and the arbitration board shall report to the National Mediation Board in the same manner as arbitration boards functioning pursuant to the Railway Labor Act [this chapter].

* * * * * * * *

Railway Labor Act, Sec. 7.

Third.

* * * * * * * *

(b) **Organization of board; procedure.**

The board of arbitration shall organize and select its own chairman and make all necessary rules for conducting its hearings: *Provided, however,* That the board of arbitration shall be bound to give the parties to the controversy a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims, and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by other representative as they may respectively elect.

(c) **Duty to reconvene; questions considered.**

Upon notice from the Mediation Board that the parties, or either party, to an arbitration desire the reconvening of the board of arbitration (or a subcommittee of such board of arbitration appointed for such purpose pursuant to the agreement to arbitrate) to pass upon any controversy over the meaning or application of their award, the board, or its subcommittee, shall at once reconvene. No question other than, or in addition to, the questions relating to the meaning or application of the award, submitted by the party or parties in writing, shall be considered by the reconvened board of arbitration or its subcommittee.

Such rulings shall be acknowledged by such board or subcommittee thereof in the same manner, and filed in the same district court clerk's office, as the original award and become a part thereof.

* * * * * * * *

(e) **Compensation and expenses.**

Each member of any board of arbitration created under the provisions of this chapter named by either party to the arbitration shall be compensated by the party naming him. Each arbitrator selected by the arbitrators or named by the Mediation Board shall receive from the Mediation Board such compensation as the Mediation Board may fix, together with his necessary traveling ex-

penses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence, while serving as an arbitrator.

(f) **Award; disposition of original and copies.**

The board of arbitration shall furnish a certified copy of its award to the respective parties to the controversy, and shall transmit the original, together with the papers and proceedings and a transcript of the evidence taken at the hearings, certified under the hands of at least a majority of the arbitrators, to the clerk of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose or the arbitration is entered into, to be filed in said clerk's office as hereinafter provided. The said board shall also furnish a certified copy of its award, and the papers and proceedings, including testimony relating thereto, to the Mediation Board to be filed in its office; and in addition a certified copy of its award shall be filed in the office of the Interstate Commerce Commission: *Provided, however,* That such award shall not be construed to diminish or extinguish any of the powers or duties of the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

(g) **Compensation of assistants to board of arbitration; expenses; quarters.**

A board of arbitration may, subject to the approval of the Mediation Board, employ and fix the compensation of such assistants as it deems necessary in carrying on the arbitration proceedings. The compensation of such employees, together with their necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence, while so employed, and the necessary expenses of boards of arbitration, shall be paid by the Mediation Board.

Whenever practicable, the board shall be supplied with suitable quarters in any Federal building located at its place of meeting or at any place where the board may conduct its proceedings or deliberations.

(h) Testimony before board; oaths; attendance of witnesses; production of documents; subpoenas; compulsion of witnesses; fees.

All testimony before said board shall be given under oath or affirmation, and any member of the board shall have the power to administer oaths or affirmations. The board of arbitration, or any member thereof, shall have the power to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents as may be deemed by the board of arbitration material to a just determination of the matters submitted to its arbitration.

* * * * * * *

Railway Labor Act, Sec. 8.

(k) Shall provide that the award of the board of arbitration and the evidence of the proceedings before the board relating thereto, when certified under the hands of at least a majority of the arbitrators, shall be filed in the clerk's office of the district court of the United States for the district wherein the controversy arose or the arbitration was entered into, which district shall be designated in the agreement; and, when so filed, such award and proceedings shall constitute the full and complete record of the arbitration;

* * * * * * *

(m) Shall provide that any difference arising as to the meaning, or the application of the provisions, of an award made by a board of arbitration shall be referred back for a ruling to the same board, or, by agreement, to a subcommittee of such board; and that such ruling, when acknowledged in the same manner, and filed in the same district court clerk's office, as the original award, shall be a part of and shall have the same force and effect as such original award; and

* * * * * * *

Railway Labor Act, Sec. 9.

Award and judgment thereon; effect of chapter on individual employee—Filing of award.

First. The award of a board of arbitration, having been acknowledged as herein provided, shall be filed in the clerk's office of the district court designated in the agreement to arbitrate.

Conclusiveness of award; judgment.

Second. An award acknowledged and filed as herein provided shall be conclusive on the parties as to the merits and facts of the controversy submitted to arbitration, and unless, within ten days after the filing of the award, a petition to impeach the award, on the grounds hereinafter set forth, shall be filed in the clerk's office of the court in which the award has been filed, the court shall enter judgment on the award, which judgment shall be final and conclusive on the parties.

Impeachment of award; grounds.

Third. Such petition for the impeachment or contesting of any award so filed shall be entertained by the court only on one or more of the following grounds:

(a) That the award plainly does not conform to the substantive requirements laid down by this chapter for such awards, or that the proceedings were not substantially in conformity with this chapter;

(b) That the award does not conform, nor confine itself, to the stipulations of the agreement to arbitrate; or

(c) That a member of the board of arbitration rendering the award was guilty of fraud or corruption;

* * * * * * * *

Effect of partial invalidity of award.

Fourth. If the court shall determine that a part of the award is invalid on some ground or grounds designated in this section as a ground of invalidity, but shall determine that a part of the award is valid, the court shall set aside the entire award: *Provided, however,* That, if the parties shall agree thereto, and if such valid and invalid parts are separable, the court shall set aside the invalid part, and order judgment to stand as to the valid part.

• • • • • • • •

APPENDIX D.

United States Court of Appeals
For the District of Columbia Circuit

No. 20,348
No. 20,349

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen,
Appellant

v.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific
Railroad Company (Lines East), et al.,
Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia

Decided July 27, 1967

Before: Bastian, *Senior Circuit Judge* and Burger and Wright, *Circuit Judges.*

Per Curiam: This is another "manifestation of a litigation syndrome that seems to keep the railroads and

various governmental entities in the courts on an ancient issue." *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.*, ... U. S. App. D. C. ..., ..., ... F. 2d ..., ... (Nos. 19,867, 20,003-04, decided May 19, 1967, slip op, p. 1). Issues raised in these appeals have been before this court previously in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., ibid.*, and *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., et al.*, ... U. S. App. D. C. ..., ... F. 2d ..., ... (Nos. 20,212-13, decided May 19, 1967). Our prior opinions are controlling and dispositive of these issues and there is no need to supplement those opinions.

In addition, however, Appellant Brotherhood raises a new claim in these appeals. It now contends that the hearing before the Special Board of Adjustment did not afford it due process of law because of certain alleged procedural irregularities not heretofore considered.[1] Although these issues were exhaustively discussed and found to be without merit in Judge Robinson's original decision in the District Court, *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.*, 237 F. Supp. 404, 418-25 (D. D. C. 1964), we remanded that case to Board 282 in order that it might pass upon these issues. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.*, 120 U. S. App. D. C. 295, 345 F. 2d 985 (1965). The Board concluded that the alleged procedural irregularities, considered singly or together, did not deprive the B. R. T. of the minimum essentials of a full and fair hearing.

[1] Specifically the union claims that it was impossible to decide the job assignments in 60 days; that the hearing held in the company offices was inherently unfair and offered little time or space for interviews with witnesses; that there was a failure to allow a reasonable time to submit written exhibits; that the "referee" was not neutral; and that the "findings" were prepared by the company and submitted to the referee for approval.

We have previously upheld the Board determination that due process was not violated by lack of a transcript; we similarly affirmed the Board decision that a "meaningful review" had been provided. Although it would appear that the specific defects raised here are subsumed within the due process concept of "meaningful review" we did not discuss them in our prior opinions. We have now fully examined the claim newly raised on this appeal, and we find it to be without merit.

Affirmed.

Wright, *Circuit Judge, dissenting*: Public Law 88-108[1] provides that the compulsory arbitration required in this case "shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act." Pub. L. 88-108, § 4. As I have indicated in my dissents in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., et al.*, Nos. 20,212-3, and *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific RR Co., et al.*, Nos. 19,867, 20,003 and 20,004, decided May 19, 1967, the Compulsory Arbitration Board convened pursuant to Public Law 88-108 cannot avoid this statutory requirement by delegating portions of its authority to local boards.

In these cases appellant makes the additional point that the local board deprived it of the minimum essentials of a full and fair hearing in that, among other things, it was denied a reasonable opportunity to prepare its case, to call witnesses, and to conduct cross-examination. The company, of course, argues that the board hearing was full and fair. Since, in violation of Section 7 of the Railway Labor Act[2] and in spite of appellant's request, no transcript of the proceedings before the local board was provided, I am unable to resolve this due process issue on this record.

I respectfully dissent.

---

[1] 77 Stat. 132 (1963), 45 U. S. C., § 157 (1964).

[2] 45 U. S. C., § 157 (1964).

APPENDIX E.

Excerpt From Pages 10 and 11 of Brief for Appellees in Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Appellant, v. Certain Carriers Represented by the Eastern, Western & Southeastern Carriers Conference Committees, and Particularly the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Natchez & Southern Railway Company and the Texas & Pacific Railroad Company, Appellees, No. 18,844 in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, 349 F. 2d 207 (1965).

"When the carriers, after January 25, 1964, commenced initial steps looking toward the putting into effect of provisions of the Award of Arbitration Board No. 282, numerous questions were raised with respect to the correct interpretation of various provisions of that Award. Both the carriers and the labor organizations, including the BRT, requested the Arbitration Board to reconvene to pass upon specified questions said to include disputes by the parties as to meaning and application of the Award.

* * * * * * * *

Question No. 21, submitted by the BRT on May 21, 1964, reads:

"Is our understanding correct that special boards of adjustment established pursuant to the award of Arbitration Board 282, Section III, Part B, having no procedure stipulated by agreement, must therefore conduct their arbitration pursuant to Sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, to the extent that said sections are not inconsistent with Public Law 88-108, and that the awards of those special boards are subject to Section 9 of the Railway Labor Act?"

The Board on September 16, 1964 declined to answer this question and referred the parties to the decision in this case by the court below."

APPENDIX F.

Pages 62-65 of the Joint Appendix in Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, et al., Appellants, v. The Akron & Barberton Belt Railroad Company, et al., Appellees, Number 20152. In the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Stipulation as to Facts.

The undersigned parties hereby stipulate and agree, by and through counsel, for the purpose of this case as follows:

A. A number of awards have been made by special boards of adjustment constituted pursuant to Article III of the Award by Arbitration Board No. 282. Such special board awards include those listed below relating to plaintiffs in this proceeding.

Carrier	*Organization*	*Date*
Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co. and Panhandle & S. F. R. Co.[1]	BRT	Sept. 10, 1965
Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co.	BRT	Jan. 13, 1966
Atlantic Coast Line R. Co.	BRT	Nov. 24, 1964
Bangor & Aroostock Railroad Co.	BRT	May 29, 1964
Belt R. Co. of Chicago	BRT	July 21, 1964
Belt R. Co. of Chicago	BRT	Jan. 5, 1966
Boston & Maine Corporation	BRT	Oct. 1, 1964
Buffalo Creek Railroad Co.[2]	SUNA	June 23, 1965

[1] The Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co. is now part of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co.

[2] The listing herein of the award by a special board of adjustment with respect to the Buffalo Creek Railroad Co. and the SUNA is without prejudice to the position of either party in *Switchmen's Union of North America, et al. v. Buffalo Creek Railroad Co., et al.*, Civil Action No. 11,422, now pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York.

Carrier	*Organization*	*Date*
Camas Prairie Railroad Co.	SUNA	Sept. 8, 1965
Chesapeake & Ohio R. Co.	BRT	Sept. 2, 1965
Chesapeake & Ohio R. Co.	BRT	Oct. 20, 1965
Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. Co.	BRT	Jan. 17, 1966
Chicago, M. St. P. & P. R. Co. (Award No. 1)	BRT	July 10, 1964
Chicago, M. St. P. & P. R. Co. (Award No. 2)	BRT	July 10, 1964
Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co.	BRT	Aug. 28, 1964
Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co.	BRT	Dec. 9, 1964
Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co. and The Kansas City Southern R. Co. (Milwaukee-Kansas City Southern Joint Agency)	BRT	Dec. 30, 1964
Chicago & North Western R. Co.:		
CSTPM&O District—Award No. 1	BRT	Aug. 27, 1964
CSTPM&O District—Award No. 2	BRT	Aug. 27, 1964
L&M District—Award No. 1	BRT	Aug. 27, 1964
M&STL District—Award No. 1	BRT	Aug. 27, 1964
C&NW District—Award No. 1	BRT	Aug. 31, 1964
C&NW District—Award No. 2	BRT	Aug. 31, 1964
C&NW District—Award No. 3	BRT	Aug. 31, 1964
C&NW District—Award No. 4	BRT	Aug. 31, 1964
M. I. District—Award No. 1	BRT	Aug. 31, 1964
M&STL District—Award No. 1	SUNA	Aug. 27, 1964
Chicago, Rock Island & P. R. Co.	SUNA	Sept. 15, 1964
Chicago, Rock Island & P. R. Co.	SUNA	Nov. 20, 1965
Chicago & W.I.R. Co.	BRT	Dec. 12, 1964
Cincinnati Union Terminal Co.	BRT	Aug. 3, 1965
Clinchfield R. Co.	SUNA	Aug. 26, 1965
Colorado & Southern R. Co.	BRT	July 21, 1964
Davenport, R. I. & N. W. R. Co.	SUNA	Aug. 27, 1964

Carrier	*Organization*	*Date*
Ft. Worth & Denver R. Co.	BRT	May 20, 1964
Ft. Worth & Denver R. Co.	SUNA	May 27, 1964
Great Northern R. Co.	SUNA	Dec. 2, 1965
Green Bay & Western Railroad Co. and Kewanee, Green Bay & Western Railroad Co.	BRT	Jan. 25, 1966
Illinois Central R. Co.	BRT	Sept. 14, 1964
Illinois Central R. Co.	BRT	Nov. 30, 1964
Illinois Central R. Co.	BRT	Feb. 26, 1965
Illinois Central R. Co.	BRT	Oct. 26, 1965
Jacksonville Terminal Co.	BRT	Nov. 5, 1965
Kansas City Terminal R. Co.	SUNA	Dec. 21, 1964
Kansas City, Oklahoma & G. R. Co.	BRT	June 6, 1964
Kentucky & Indiana T. R. Co.	BRT	Aug. 17, 1964
Kentucky & Indiana T. R. Co.	BRT	Mar. 22, 1965
King Street Passenger Station	BRT	Jan. 4, 1965
Maine Central Railroad Co.	BRT	May 29, 1964
Midland Valley R. Co.	BRT	June 6, 1964
Minnesota, Dakota & Western R. Co.	BRT	Dec. 11, 1965
Missouri-Illinois R. Co.	BRT	Apr. 22, 1964
Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. Co.	BRT	May 14, 1964
Missouri Pacific R. Co. (Northern, Central and Southern Districts)	BRT	May 6, 1964
Missouri Pacific R. Co. (Gulf District)	BRT	May 6, 1964
Natchez & Southern R. Co.[3]	BRT	May 6, 1964
Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. New Orleans & L. C. R. Co.	BRT	May 14, 1964
New Orleans U.P. Terminal	BRT	May 23, 1964
Norfolk & Western R. Co.	BRT	Jan. 5, 1966
Norfolk & Western R. Co.	BRT	Jan. 7, 1966

[3] The Natchez and Southern Railway Co. is now a part of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

Carrier	*Organization*	*Date*
Norfolk & Western R. Co.	BRT	Jan. 21, 1966
Northern Pac. T. Co. of Oregon[4]	SUNA	July 15, 1965
Port Terminal R. Ass'n	BRT	May 14, 1964
Reading Company (Case No. 1)	BRT	Nov. 19, 1965
Reading Company (Case No. 2)	BRT	Nov. 19, 1965
Richmond, F. & P. R. Co.	BRT	Jan. 20, 1966
St. Louis Southwestern R. Co.	BRT	July 14, 1964
St. Louis & S. F. R. Co.	BRT	June 6, 1964
St. Paul Union Depot Co.	SUNA	Nov. 1, 1965
St. Paul Union Depot Co.	SUNA	Jan. 24, 1966
Southern Pacific Co.	BRT	June 4, 1964
Southern Pacific Co.	SUNA	Sept. 8, 1964
Southern Pacific Co.	SUNA	June 17, 1965
Southern Pacific Co.	SUNA	Nov. 22, 1965
Spokane, P. & S. R. Co.	BRT	Nov. 15, 1965
Terminal R. Ass'n of St. L.	BRT	Oct. 16, 1964
Texas & Pacific R. Co.[5]	BRT	May 6, 1964
Texas Pacific-Missouri Pacific Term. R. Co. of N. O.	SUNA	May 16, 1964
Union Railway Co.	BRT	May 14, 1964
Union Term. & St. J. Belt R. Cos.	BRT	May 15, 1964
Wabash Railroad Co.[6]	BRT	Undated
Washington Terminal Co.	BRT	Oct. 15, 1964
Washington Terminal Co.	BRT	Nov. 26, 1965

---

[4] The Northern Pacific Terminal Company of Oregon now is the Portland Terminal Railroad Company.

[5] The special board award also applies to subsidiaries of the Texas & Pacific Railway Company—Abilene & Southern Railway, Fort Worth Belt Railway Co., Texas-New Mexico Railway Co. and the Weatherford, Mineral Wells & North Western Railway Co.

[6] The Wabash Railroad Co. is now a part of the Norfolk and Western Railway Co.